

**REMARKS**

Claims 67, 76, 87-88, and 92 have been amended. Claims 68-82, 86-89, 92-98 are pending in the application. Applicant reserves the right to pursue the original claims and other claims in this and other applications.

Claim 76 has been amended to correct typographical errors.

The drawings stand objected to. The Office Action states that the “signal source having first and second outputs coupled to the first and second transmission members” must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). Claim 88 has been amended to recite “a first and a second signal source respectively having first and second signal outputs.” This feature is supported by the specification. *See, e.g.*, Fig. 8 (illustrating a signal receiver comprising amplifier A1 configured to receive a first signal on a first transmission line 152A and amplifier A2 coupled to configured to receive a second signal on a second transmission line 152B).

Claims 88-89 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The Office Action states that the claims contain subject matter not described in the disclosure. More specifically, the Office Action states that the limitation “signal source having first and second outputs coupled to the first and second transmission member” is not supported by the disclosure. Claim 88 has been amended to address this issue. Accordingly, the rejection to claims 88-89 should be withdrawn.

Claims 88-89 and 92-98 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishimura et al. (US 5,013,942) in view of Doblar et al. (US 6,477,205). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness “the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.”

M.P.E.P. §2142. Neither Nishimura et al. nor Doblar et al., even when considered in combination, teach or suggest all limitations of claims 88 and 92.

Claim 88, as amended, recites, *inter alia*, “[a] signal transmission system comprising: [a] first transmission member including a first transmission medium having an impedance less than 100 ohms.” (Emphasis added.) Claim 92, as amended, recites, *inter alia*, “[a] method of synchronizing first and second operations of respective first and second circuits comprising: ... a first transmission member, said first transmission member having a first signal propagation factor ..., said first signal propagation factor related to an impedance less than 100 ohms of said first transmission member.” (Emphasis added.) As noted in the Specification at Nishimura et al. does not disclose this limitation.

Nishimura et al. teaches “input line lengths from a point 5A on the output side of a first buffer 10 to each of points 5C, 5D, . . . , 5F, and 5G.” Col. 4, ln. 31-33. There is no suggestion of an impedance less than 100 ohms. Nor does Doblar et al. teach this limitation. Doblar et al. teaches “[t]he termination resistor may have a value substantially equal to a characteristic impedance of the transmission line such that signal reflections and distortion occurring within the transmission line are substantially reduced.” Col. 3, ln. 62-65. There is no suggestion of an impedance less than 100 ohms. Thus, Doblar et al. does not remedy the deficiency of Nishimura et al. Since Nishimura et al. and Doblar et al. do not teach or suggest all of the limitations of claims 88 and 92, claims 88 and 92 are not obvious over the cited references.

Further, the combination of a first transmission member having first transmission medium with an impedance less than 100 ohms and changing an

impedance of a second transmission member is not taught or suggested by the cited references.

Claim 88 depends from claim 89 and is patentable at least for the reasons mentioned above. Claims 93-97 depend from claim 92 and are patentable at least for the reasons mentioned above. Claim 98 depends from independent claim 67 and should be allowable along with claim 67 and for other reasons. Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 88-89 and 92-98 be withdrawn.

Claims 67-82 and 86-87 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art (APA) in view of Nishimura et al. and further in view of Doblar et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

None of APA, Nishimura et al., nor Doblar et al., even when considered in combination, teach or suggest all limitations of claims 67 and 87. Claims 67 and 87, as amended, recites, *inter alia*, "[a] signal transmission system comprising: a first transmission member having a first length and an impedance less than 100 ohms." (Emphasis added.) As discussed above relating to the patentability of claim 88, Nishimura et al. does not disclose this limitation. Nishimura et al. teaches "input line lengths from a point 5A on the output side of a first buffer 10 to each of points 5C, 5D, . . . , 5F, and 5G." Col. 4, ln. 31-33. There is no suggestion of an impedance less than 100 ohms. Nor are Doblar et al. or APA cited for this limitation. Doblar et al. teaches "a characteristic impedance." Col. 3, ln. 63. There is no suggestion of an impedance less than 100 ohms. Nor is APA cited for this limitation. Thus, Doblar et al. and APA do not remedy the deficiency of Nishimura et al.

Further, the combination recited in claims 67 and 87 of a first transmission member having an impedance less than 100 ohms and an impedance adjusting

component coupled to a second transmission member is not taught or suggested by the cited references.

Since Nishimura et al., Doblar et al., and APA do not teach or suggest all of the limitations of claims 67 and 87, claims 67 and 87 are not obvious over the cited references. Claims 68-82 and 86 depend from claim 67 and should be allowable along with claim 67 and for other reasons. Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 67-82 and 86-87 be withdrawn.

In view of the above amendment, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: August 22, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Thomas J. D'Amico

Registration No.: 28,371

Rachael Lea Leventhal

Registration No.: 54,266

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &

OSHINSKY LLP

2101 L Street NW

Washington, DC 20037-1526

(202) 785-9700

Attorneys for Applicant